

REMARKS

Claims 1–48 are pending in this application, prior to entry of this amendment. Claims 36 and 44–48 were allowed. Various claims have been amended to address issues raised by the examiner, and also for overall clarification of the claimed subject matter.

Claims 5, 10, 16, 21, and 25 have been canceled as the subject matter has been rewritten in independent form.

Claims 40–42 have also been canceled.

New claims 49–63 are presented for entry. These claims present the subject matter of objected-to claims in independent form for the most part and should be allowable.

The following sections correspond to the sections in the office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 7 was rejected on the ground that the claim recites the limitation “the bin number” in line 1 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The proper support for “the bin number” is found in claim 6 rather than claim 1.

Claim 7 has been amended accordingly to change the dependency reference.

Similarly, claim 18 was rejected on the ground that the claim lacks the proper antecedent basis for the limitation “the bin number” as recited in line 1. Correct support for this limitation is found in claim 17.

This rejection is not understood and therefore traversed. No correction to claim 18 to correct antecedent basis is believed necessary. Please advise the undersigned if something else was intended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1–4, 9, 15, 20, 24–33, 35, and 37–43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Cook et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,153)(hereinafter *Cook*).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 15, 20, and 39–43, the examiner asserted that *Cook* discloses a method and apparatus for authorizing a transaction between a consumer and a merchant over a network where the anonymity of the consumer with respect to the merchant is maintained while still validating the authenticity of the consumer prior to completing the transaction, and further

that the system includes a central processing database (figure 1; Zixcharge secure data center 102) for maintaining true name, true address, true account number, and alias name, alias address, and alias account number. According to *Cook*, aliases such as alias address, alias account, and alias name can be used for conducting transactions without revealing real personal information on the Internet, websites, and/or even merchants for security and privacy purposes.

Regarding claim 1, this claim has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of objected-to claim 5, and is not anticipated (and is not admitted to have been anticipated previously). No further comments are believed necessary in view of the incorporation of the objected-to subject matter. (Claim 5 has been canceled.)

Regarding claims 2–4, these are dependent claims and should be allowable under the doctrine of *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 1988), which asserts that if the independent claim is allowable, then the dependent claims should also be allowed since dependent claims add further limitations. On this basis the rejection of claims 2–4 should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 24–29 and 37–38, the examiner rejected these claims on the same grounds as claim 1. The examiner apparently considers the alias address as the unique personal mail code; the step of correlating the alias address with the true/real physical address is considered as the claimed mapping step; the step of receiving and/or sending real shipping address to the shipper as the necessary functions of the Zixcharge Secure Data Center 102.

Independent claim 24 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 25, namely, to recite the steps of registering the customer with a private mail service by providing to the private mail service the customer's name and the first delivery address, creating a secret customer identifier, and providing the secret customer identifier to the customer; and also including steps of generating a first unique personal mail code and assigning the first unique personal mail code to the customer. Further amendments include reciting the step of the customer providing the first unique personal mail code to the item provider, and the item provider shipping the item to the shipper together with the first unique personal mail code.

These steps are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in *Cook*. The *Cook* patent simply provides no teachings about the registration of a customer with a private mail service, together with the claimed limitations of secret customer identifier and unique personal mail code that is resolved into a physical delivery address. Rather, the *Cook* patent merely relates to transaction authentication without any consideration whatsoever, let alone a teaching or disclosure, about

physically shipping the items to the customer. As amended, claim 24 is clearly novel and nonobvious in view of *Cook*.

Claim 25 has been canceled.

Claim 26 has been amended to correct the dependency reference.

Claims 26–35 are all dependent under claim 24. Such claims should be allowable under *In re Fine, supra*.

As regards independent claim 43, the examiner's rejection is not understood and is therefore traversed. It is not understood how the examiner can find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in the *Cook* patent as to the claimed limitations, among other things, of transmitting a message containing account information associated with an alias account to a mail distributor, receiving a message with the alias identity at the mail distributor's facility and identifying the message as a message identified with the alias identity, retrieving the real identity, substituting the alias identity with the real identity, and transmitting a message identified with the real identity from the mail distributor to the cardholder. It is not believed that such elements, among others, can be found in the *Cook* patent, and so the claim is believed novel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cook*. The examiner referred to the discussion regarding claim 20, and asserted that the claim differs in calling for a wireless communication link between the shipper and the central server, in this case the Zixcharge Secure Data Center 102. The examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to replace the communication link between the Zixcharge Data Center 102 and the shipper with a wireless communication link, and further that the modification is merely a substitution of one type of communication link with another; and was considered to be well within the skill levels and expectations of an ordinary skilled artisan.

Claim 22 is a dependent claim under claim 20. Claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of objected-to claim 21. As such, both claims 20 and 22 are believed novel and nonobvious, and no further comments are believed necessary.

Allowable Subject Matter

The allowability of claims 36, and 44–48 is noted with appreciation.

Claims 5–6, 8, 10–14, 16–17, 19, 21, 23, and 34 were all rejected as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is intended to identify the manner in which various of the objected-to claims have been rewritten and presented.

Objected-to claim 5 has been rewritten by incorporating its subject matter into independent claim 1; claim 5 has been canceled. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable, as is its remaining dependent claims 2–4 and 6–8.

Objected-to claim 8 is now presented in independent form as new independent claim 49. Claims 50–54 are dependent under claim 49.

Objected-to claim 10 has been rewritten by incorporating its subject matter into independent claim 9; claim 10 has been canceled. Accordingly, claim 9 is believed allowable, as is its remaining dependent claims 11–14.

Objected-to claim 16 has been rewritten by incorporating its subject matter into independent claim 15; claim 16 has been canceled. Accordingly, claim 15 is believed allowable, as is its remaining dependent claims 17–19.

Objected-to claim 21 has been rewritten by incorporating its subject matter into independent claim 20; claim 21 has been cancelled. According, claim 20 is believed allowable, as its remaining dependent claims 22–23.

The objection to claim 34 is not understood and therefore traversed, at least in part. Two remarks in this regard are provided.

First, new independent claim 55 presents the subject matter of objected to claims 34, 33, 25, and 24 in independent form, for the most part: the step of “paying the private mail service” was not included as the claim is believed patentable without this step, and the step of “the customer providing the first unique personal mail code to the item provider, the item provider shipping the item to the shipper together with the first unique personal mail code” was added to improve the overall comprehensibility of the claim. (Claims 56–63 are further dependent claims.)

Second, and as discussed in detail earlier herein, claim 24 (on which claim 34 was ultimately dependent) has been amended to incorporate certain limitations from dependent claims 25 and 33, which is believed sufficient to make the claim novel and nonobvious (without

admitting that the claim otherwise lacked novelty and/or was obvious). Claim 34 was dependent on claim 33, but included a number of limitations that are not believed necessary for patentability, as discussed earlier. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claim 24, as amended, should be allowable as rewritten.


As regards the examiner's statement of reasons for indication of allowable subject matter, the applicant respectfully defers any comments on such reasons pending a final indication of allowability and/or a Notice of Allowance.

* * * * *

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that all claims are believed novel, nonobvious, fully supported, and should be allowable. The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed June 29, 2006 and is believed to place all claims in the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application be allowed and that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case then the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 404 504 7720.

Respectfully submitted,



John R. Harris - Reg. No. 30,388

Date: October 30, 2006

MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP
1600 Atlanta Financial Center
3343 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(404) 233-7000
email: jrh@mmmlaw.com
Our Docket: 4960-46360